

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-33 are currently being cancelled.

No claims are currently being amended.

Claims 34-59 are currently being added.

This amendment adds and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding and canceling the claims as set forth above, claims 34-59 are now pending in this application.

Request for Consideration of Information Disclosure Statement (IDS):

Applicants respectfully request that the PTO indicate acknowledgement of the IDS filed on March 17, 2005, by including an initialed copy of the PTO SB/08 form submitted with that IDS in the next PTO correspondence to Applicant.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claims 26 and 27 were objected to, because of informalities noted on page 2 of the Office Action. Due to the cancellation of claims 26 and 27, this objection is now moot.

New Customer Number and Address Change:

Please note that the correspondence address has now changed to the address provided for customer number 22428 (a different office of the same law firm). A change of correspondence address form is being filed concurrently herewith.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 10, 11 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,856,759 to Fukuda et al.; claims 1, 2, 20, 21, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,362 to Kato et al.; claims 3-5, 22, 23, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. and Kato et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0159766 to Hisatomi et al.; claims 6, 24, 27 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. and Kato et al. and further in view of European Patent Application EP 1 195 767 to Winter et al.; claims 7-9, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. and Kato et al. and Winter et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0159766 to Hisatomi et al.; claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. in view of Hisatomi et al.; claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. in view of Winter et al.; claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. and Winter et al. and further in view of Hisatomi et al.; and claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. and Kato et al. and Hisatomi et al., and further in view of Winter et al. These rejections are traversed with respect to new claims 34-59, for at least the reasons given below.

In the present invention as recited in new claim 34, first data including first video data units represented with nonuniform aspect ratios is converted into second data including second video data units represented with uniform aspect ratios. More specifically, the rewriting nonuniform aspect data included in each first video data unit is converted into the uniform aspect data included in each second video data unit.

The aspect data is a type of management information. Accordingly, even if the aspect data is rewritten, the actual aspect ratio of video data is not changed. For instance, even if first aspect data with a first aspect ratio is converted into second aspect data with a second aspect ratio, the actual aspect ratio of video data is not changed. Namely, the actual aspect ratio of the video data is kept to be nonuniform. Therefore, the converted second data

contains video data represented with inappropriate aspect ratios. As a result, when the converted second data is reproduced, a slight problem may well occur.

In the present invention as recited in new independent claim 34, apparent aspect conversion is performed, and no actual video-data aspect conversion is performed. This is done in order to convert data of the DVD-VR format into data of the DVD-video format. In the DVD-VR format, different aspect ratios can be set for relatively small video data units (VOBU units). In contrast, in the DVD-video format, such different aspect ratio setups for relatively small video data units are not permitted. This is described in paragraph 0005 of the specification.

When data of the DVD-VR format is converted into data of the DVD-video format, it is very useful to change the apparent aspect ratio. For instance, when a user attempts to copy data of the DVD-VR format, recorded on a hard disk, to a disk such as a DVD-R, the data of the DVD-VR format is converted into data of the DVD-video format, and the thus-obtained DVD-video format data is recorded on the disk. At this time, it is inconvenient if much time is needed for copying. The above-mentioned apparent aspect-ratio change enables copying to be executed in a short time. In contrast, if actual aspect-ratio change is performed, it is difficult to perform copying in a short time, which is inconvenient to the user.

Similar comments apply to new independent claims 43, 47 and 56.

In contrast to the above features recited in the new claims, Fukuda et al. merely discloses a technique of detecting a change of aspect ratio in a data stream, and does not even suggest a technique of changing an apparent aspect ratio as employed in the present invention. Similarly, neither Kato et al. nor Hisatomi et al. nor Winter et al. teaches or suggests the apparent aspect-ratio changing technique employed in the presently claimed invention.

Accordingly, new independent claims 34, 43, 47 and 56 patentably distinguish over the cited art of record, when taken as a whole.

The new dependent claims further distinguish over the cited art of record due to the specific features recited in those claims.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 14, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202)672-5300
Facsimile: (202)672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438